

goods like textiles that are often entry level transformation industries for developing countries. In this, they say, there could be a payoff for the West as well.

"Aid to Africa is not welfare," J. Brian Atwood, the administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, wrote recently in *The International Herald Tribune*. "Africa is today what Latin American and Asian markets were a generation ago. It is the last great developing market." But what many see as a sensible management of long-term interests collides with political expediency. "Putting people on their feet is just good business sense" said Edward V. K. Jaycox, vice president of the World Bank. "But it is a question of old-fashioned industrial structures in the north, where a lot of people are engaged in activities that they are loath to give up." By that he meant something very much like what Mr. Nkrumah used to say: If the West really wants to see an Africa healthy for investment, it should stop raiding the gold veins and diamond mines and open not just its wallets but its markets as well.●

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, today I rise as a proud cosponsor of the constitutional balanced budget amendment, and I urge its adoption. I hope that today, we will be able to enlist the support of the 67 Senators necessary to pass this balanced budget amendment.

The time has come to put an end to out of control Federal spending that has taken money from the private sector—the very sector that creates jobs and economic opportunity for all Americans.

The President's recent budget proposals for next year offer clear evidence of the lack of political will to make the hard choices when it comes to cutting Government spending. I strongly disagree with President Clinton's decision not to fight for further deficit reduction this year.

The American people are crying out for a smaller, more efficient Government. They are concerned about the trends that for too long has put the interests of big Government before the interests of our job-creating private sector. They are irritated by the double standard that exists between how our families are required to balance their checkbooks and how Government is allowed to continue spending despite its deficit accounts.

It's clear, Mr. President. The time has come to heed the will of the people. It is our duty, not only to heed their will, but to act in their best interest. And this amendment is in their best interest.

The President's budget maintains deficits of \$200 billion over the next 5 years, and the deficits go up from there. His budget does not take seriously the need for spending restraint—restraint that would put us on a path toward a balanced budget by the year 2002.

In fact, Bill Clinton proposes spending over \$1.5 trillion in fiscal year 1995 to over \$1.9 trillion in the year 2000. In other words, the only path that the president proposes is one that leads to

higher Government spending and ever increasing deficits.

Mr. President, my decision to cosponsor this legislation was not made lightly. The U.S. Constitution is our Nation's most sacred document. Dozens of countries have modeled their constitutions around the principles espoused in ours. Many of the emerging democracies around the world recognize the profound simplicity and timelessness contained in that hallowed document.

Any amendments to the Constitution should be made with care, and with careful consideration of the intended outcome.

I believe the outcome of a balanced budget for our Nation is one of the most important steps we can take to ensure the economic opportunities for prosperity for our children and for our children's children.

As a nation—and as individuals—we are morally bound to pass opportunity and security to the next generation. This is what a balanced budget amendment will help us do. As Thomas Paine has written, no government or group of people has the right to shackle succeeding generations with its obligations. A balanced budget amendment will help us prevent the shackling of future generations.

As chairman of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee I have outlined a plan to reduce the Federal bureaucracy, eliminate out-dated and wasteful Government programs, and to strengthen Government's ability to better serve the taxpayers.

In January I kicked off a series of hearings on "Government Reform: Building a Structure for the 21st Century." It is my belief that as we move into the 21st century, so should our Government. Innovative technologies should allow us to cut out many layers of management bureaucracy, and reduce Federal employment. Programmatic changes should also occur.

Last month, I released a report that I asked the GAO to examine the current structure of the Federal Government. The GAO examined all budget and Government functions and missions. They did not conduct in-depth analysis, but simply illustrated the complex web and conflicting missions under which agencies are currently operating.

The GAO report confirms that our Federal behemoth must be reformed to meet the needs of all taxpayers for the 21st century. I am convinced that it is through a smaller, smarter Government we will be able to serve Americans into the next century.

Deficit spending can not continue. We can no longer allow waste, inefficiency, and overbearing Government to consume the potential of America's future. I am committed to spending restraint as we move to balance the budget by the year 2002. And I ask my colleagues—and all Americans—to support our efforts.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. I would ask that I use part of the leader time accorded to me this morning to make a statement as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we have had 4 weeks of hard-fought and very earnest debate. The issues are serious and the stakes are high. We are proposing to amend our Constitution for only the 28th time now in more than two centuries. The debate has been vigorous. Virtually every Senator has spoken from virtually every perspective. Persuasive arguments have been made by both Democratic and Republican Senators, and I respect the positions which my colleagues have adopted even in those cases where I do not share their position. I recognize that each Senator has reached his or her position with thought and care and the best of motives.

There is something upon which we all agree, and upon which we have agreed since the debate began; that is, the underlying need to reduce the deficit and balance the budget. We need to put the budget on a glidepath to balance, and we are agreed that for the sake of working families and the future economic strength of the Nation we must move toward a balanced budget.

One thing we should all agree upon is that regardless of the outcome of the final vote, we will work together to develop a deficit-reduction package that will put the budget on a glidepath to balance. I stand ready to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to achieve that goal.

Now, the question is how best to continue the effort that we have begun throughout this decade, an effort begun in 1991 with a significant deficit reduction proposal, and again in 1993 with \$600 billion of additional deficit reduction. The question is can we achieve what we all say we want with the balanced budget proposal before us? The question is how best to achieve a balanced budget using the methods that we have available to us. And where we differ is whether the amendment that is now pending reflects our best effort to amend the Constitution and achieve our goal of a balanced Federal budget.

Amending the Constitution is not a frivolous undertaking. We will not be able to come back next year and fix our drafting mistakes. Many of us have concluded, regretfully, that this is not our best effort. In fact, in our view, our best efforts were rejected. To strengthen the amendment, we offered amendments, but they were defeated essentially along partisan lines, amendments that we felt ought to have been considered more carefully by our colleagues on the other side, amendments like the right-to-know proposal which

laid out the blueprint that we all agree is necessary if, indeed, we are serious about reaching our goal in a short period of time.

In a matter of 7 years, we proclaim today, if we pass this amendment, we will have a balanced Federal budget. But we all recognize privately that, unless we have a blueprint, we simply cannot achieve that goal in any meaningful way without using smoke and mirrors, without a blueprint.

The American people have stated very clearly their desire to see a blueprint, and indeed that is what we tried to offer as we considered this amendment many weeks ago. Some of us suggested that we provide for a capital budget so the Federal budget would work like the budgets of virtually every business, every State, every family in this country. We wanted to preserve the ability to respond to national security or economic emergencies, something that we have attempted to address in amendments as well. We tried to protect against unconstitutional Presidential impoundments and preserve the integrity of Congress' power of the purse. We tried to protect veterans' health programs and pensions.

Finally, we tried to protect Social Security, to make certain that all those commitments we made verbally on the Senate floor and in the media about protecting Social Security would in fact be kept when the amendment became part of the U.S. Constitution. On Social Security alone we had a number of different votes, different ways to make certain that the solemn commitment to protect the money in the trust fund would not be broken by a future Congress. We ran into a stone wall and, as a result, Social Security, despite Republican claims to the contrary, is legally and realistically available for cuts. We know that. And the Social Security trust funds are completely vulnerable to being raided.

Those who support the idea of a balanced budget amendment worked to improve this proposal so that it would be balanced and that we could in conscience vote for it without relying upon those trust funds for the next 7 years. But those efforts, too, were rejected.

We are still committed to balancing the budget. As supporters of this proposal have told television reporters outside the Senate Chamber, passage in this Chamber will not bring the budget one penny closer to real balance. Only we can do that. There is no machine that ultimately is incorporated in this Constitution that will force us to do what we are unable to do today. That is up to us. It is important that we understand that. It is we who must take that responsibility and no one else.

Some will attempt to characterize a vote against this flawed amendment as a vote against balancing the budget, but that is not what this vote is about. As I said, we all agree on the impor-

tance of balancing the budget. But this amendment simply does not do the job.

For the past month the Republican majority has been trying to pass their balanced budget amendment and claim a political victory. They have refused to listen to those of us who support an amendment but have had concerns about the language, rejecting our proposals time after time after time. They have refused to listen to the people of this country who have a right to know about how we are going to balance the budget. And, most important, they have refused to join us as we insist on real protection for Social Security, putting their political contract ahead of a solemn contract with the American people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, leaders' time was reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I will make a motion here in a moment to have the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

I would also indicate, though I did not raise the question last night about rule XIX, I think my colleague from West Virginia came close if not being in violation of rule XIX, which states: "No Senator in debate shall directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct remotely unworthy or unbecoming a Senator." I would ask that—some of the "tawdry" references, "sleazy" references, in my view were uncalled for.

This is a very important vote. I believe there are 66 votes for the amendment, Democrats and Republicans. We need 67. Or we need 66, if there are only 99 voting.

I thought a lot about what procedure to follow after we recessed last evening. I thought about the hard work of the Senator from Utah, Senator HATCH; the Senator from Illinois, Senator SIMON; and other Democrats and Republicans who have worked and worked and worked for months and months and weeks and weeks and days and days and hours and hours in an effort to gain the support of 67 of our colleagues.

This must be bipartisan; there are only 53 Republicans. As I said last night, if you want to take a look at total nonpartisanship, take a look at Senator SIMON. He is leaving the Senate. He can do most anything. If he had any political motives, I assume—you can say, in most cases, Members have political motives—but in this case you cannot. He feels strongly about the amendment. We feel strongly about protecting Social Security. We have made a number of suggestions to Members on the other side about protecting

Social Security, but it is never quite enough, never quite enough, never quite enough.

I must say, it seems to me to be in the interest—not in our interest—in the interest of the American people; 76 to 80 percent of the American people support the balanced budget amendment. And they could care less whether we voted last night or vote today or tomorrow or next week or the next week. They know the country is in danger of economic collapse unless we do something.

The American people are very sophisticated. They listen to radio. They read the newspapers. They watch television. They watch C-SPAN. This is no time for retreat. This is a time, as far as this Senator is concerned, for all of us who believe in the balanced budget amendment on both sides of the aisle to try to find one more vote—not in some back room deal, as alleged last night by the Senator from West Virginia—but by a recognition that if we do nothing—it probably will not make any difference to us or our families, but what about the 80 percent of the American people out there who want us to balance the budget? They balance their budgets. They balance their budgets in their businesses and in their homes, and they do not understand this business-as-usual attitude in Washington.

We are going to continue to try to find one vote. If we fail on that, then I, when the vote is cast, if it ends up 66, I will change my vote and I will enter a motion to reconsider. That motion to reconsider is not debatable. It can be called up any time by the leader, and I think sometime about next September might be appropriate to reconsider this whole issue. We do not want to do it too quickly, but maybe let it—leave it out there a year. Let us see what happens as we get nearer the election and the American people are a little agitated at Congress, as they should be.

I just suggest if anyone in this Chamber on either side of the aisle can find one more vote—or send someone on vacation, who might be on the other side—we need your help. The American people need your help. This is not a battle—this is a victory—victory for whom? Not for BOB DOLE. Not for PAUL SIMON. Not for LARRY CRAIG. Not for ORRIN HATCH. Not for JIM EXON. This will be a victory for the people. That is what this is all about. Give America back to the people.

Dust off the 10th amendment. Unless the power is reserved to the Federal Government, give it back to the States and give it back to the people.

We are going to continue every way we can to make this happen.

Mr. President, I move the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I object.